



BOUTELLE & BURR, PROPRIETORS.  
C. A. BOUTELLE, EDITOR

All business letters should be addressed to Advertiser and Courier, and communications intended for proprietors should be addressed: "Editor of *Advertiser and Courier*."

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1891

### Republican Caucuses.

The Republican voters of the city of Bangor, are hereby invited to meet in caucus at the

CITY HALL.

Thursday Evening, March 6th, 1891,  
At 7:30 o'clock,  
for the purpose of nominating a candidate for Mayor, to be voted for on March 10th.

### WARD CAUCUSES.

The voters will also assemble at the polling place in the several wards on Friday evening, March 7th, at 7:30 o'clock, to nominate candidates for the various wards, and to elect a member of the Republican City Committee for each ward.

For Dealer Republican City Committee.

M. J. THACK, Chairman.

J. W. DUNIGAN, Secretary.

Unnecessary Legislation.

The time is now rapidly approaching when the House will have to vote upon the Australian ballot bill, or rather on the compromise measure that has been substituted for it. That public sentiment is constantly growing stronger against this attempt to subject the State to the expense of this needless change in our electoral system admits of no doubt. If this question were submitted to a popular vote it would be defeated. For a time there was an effort on the part of the managers of the bill to create an impression that it was demanded by the people, the object, of course, being to win over members who had not then made up their minds as to the merits of the question, but it has become necessary to abandon that position. The very men who were the most opposed in securing the alleged popularity of the measure, now admit that there was no foundation for this assertion and confess in their compromise bill that the people as a whole are opposed to the system.

We contend that in thus making this admission the bill has given the whole case away. If the bill in its original form could not pass the House, and this fact is now conceded, what can be argued in favor of this compromise bill which is even worse than the original? It ought to be argued that the *PROGRESSIVE* being opposed to the system in any form was bound to deprive the efforts of the managers to adopt it as they claimed the conditions in this State. But it happens that we have on this point the testimony of the Portland Press, a paper that has from the start favored the Australian ballot. The language of the Press is very explicit. It frankly stated that it had rather see the bill defeated outright than to pass with this optional clause, the effect of which would be to establish two sets of election machinery in the State and thus cause great confusion. Any man who will look at this matter candidly cannot fail to appreciate the force of this argument.

Why should the Legislature force this dangerous condition upon the people, knowing that they do not want it and that the system is both complicated and expensive, because all of these facts have been conceded in a way that admits of no doubt?

The Democratic papers are openly boasting that if they get this law once upon the statute books they will soon force it on many of the small towns, as with the solid Democratic vote it will only be necessary to secure a small minority of the Republicans to carry their point. They know that in those states where this style of voting has been adopted it has proved advantageous to them.

Let the Republians call a united States senator in New York, by keeping a sufficient number away from the polls to give the Assembly to the Democrats, and we believe that the unfortunate result of the late election in Massachusetts was due largely to the same cause.

Republicans are a rule are business men, and they will not give the time necessary to vote under this complicated system. We know that to-day gives us as pure a ballot as in any state in the Union, a Republican Legislature should not adopt useless machinery, the sole effect of which will be to keep voters from the polls.

### The Majority.

The Democrats hold their caucus last evening and the ill-arranged plan was ratified. Their candidate has, we believe, been before the public some four or five times as an aspirant for the office of Mayor, and the people have steadily turned a deaf ear to his entreaties. There is no reason why the result should be different this spring.

The Republicans will hold their caucus Thursday evening and we wish to impress upon our friends the importance of a full turnout. A caucus inaugurated by a large and representative caucus is half won at the start. It is therefore the duty of every Republican who can possibly do so to be present. The names of several gentlemen have been mentioned in connection with the nomination, but the field is open to all. It is, however, the majority of the Republicans to determine who shall be the standard bearer in the contest next Monday, and that the selection may reflect the wishes of the greatest possible number, it is essential that the caucus be a thoroughly representative one. Mr. Collier, who has been frequently named in connection with the nomination, declines the use of his name, a decision that will be received with regret by his friends.

### Fruits of the New Tariff.

We present below a sample list of the kind of news items with which the trade papers abound since the tariff went into effect.

Robert Dayson, a representative of an English syndicate, accompanied by F. Draper of New York, recently purchased the William Shadef farm in Falmouth, visited that town last week. The farm is located on a site on the Willimantic River road, between New London and North Railroad track, between Wethersfield and South Willington stations. The land borders a fine water privilege. The plan is to have a capital of \$250,000, employing 300 hands for the manufacture of thread and lace.

The English syndicate which proposes to have a mill at Willimantic, Conn., will manufacture at Willingham face goods. The mill will run 16 hours a day, and will employ three sets of hands, thirty men each.

A big shipment of machinery is expected in Bridgeport, Conn., in a few days, for the Sir Thomas Salt Company, of England, which, as already mentioned, there, cold, expects to open a factory in Bridgeport for the manufacture of plumes. The new shop will employ from 400 to 600 men.

A New York and Philadelphia plate glass syndicate, which will make nothing but a large grade of plate glass and will employ 300 hands, will locate a site at Christy Park, near McKeown's Park, for a plant that will cost \$1,000,000.

A new factory is to be established in Wethersfield, Conn., by the Novelty Fabrics company, which will open a factory of \$100,000, will start a lace goods factory at Christy Park, near McKeown's Park, for a plant that will cost \$1,000,000.

A new factory is to be established in Goshen, Conn., by the Novelty Fabrics company, which will open a factory of \$100,000, will start a lace goods factory at Christy Park, near McKeown's Park, for a plant that will cost \$1,000,000.

The English syndicate which proposes to have a mill at Willimantic, Conn., will manufacture at Willingham face goods. The mill will run 16 hours a day, and will employ three sets of hands, thirty men each.

The Comptroller Metal Wire Co.

land, have made an assignment of the assets placed at \$33,000. The firm was engaged in the manufacture of wire, wire mesh, wire, wire mesh, and wire mesh, and its failure is attributed to the operation of the McKinley bill.

These foreign establishments were built up and supported by appropriating to themselves the trade of our people, and if we reclaim our own bears hard upon them, we extend to them our sympathy.

Will Lead to Great Confusion.

(Portland Press.)

There is, we understand, a scheme on foot to tack on an amendment to the Australian bill, making the adoption of the system optional with the towns. It is unnecessary to say that this move emanates from sources unfriendly to the system and is intended to defeat it. Firmly as we believe in the Australian system, we should rather see the bill defeated altogether than to see it passed with this amendment, which will set up two electoral systems in Maine, and necessarily lead to great confusion. We certainly hope that none of the friends of the bill will listen to a moment to any compromise of this sort.

Mr. Bunn Makes a Record.

(Special Dispatch to the Boston Journal, Mar. 2.)

Representative Bouteille of Maine, in a very ingenious, graceful and skillful way, succeeded in passing through the House to-day a bill to provide the widow of the late Admiral Porter, with a pension of \$2,000. Mr. Bouteille presented the House a letter from the surviving children of the Admiral and the widow expressing their deep appreciation of the resolution in which the House of Representatives had extolled the virtues and commended the heroic career of the husband and father. Using this letter for a text, Mr. Bouteille, in an eloquent and touching five minute speech, asked the House to pass by unanimous consent the bill to provide the widow with the pension. There was silence in the chamber, and the Speaker was about to declare that the bill had passed with the willing consent of every member in that great chamber, when a man whose name was never probably heard by Northern readers rose to object:

It was a man with a very bold head, a very red face and a very firm jaw. He has not often appeared in the pages of the Congressional Record; he has not attracted the attention of the public press of the country, but he has done so now. Mr. Bunn—that was the name—Bunn, of North Carolina. Instantly from all sides of the chamber prominent men of both parties went to his seat beseeching him to withdraw his objections and not to be so graceless to a nation that was about to pay to one of the most illustrious of its patriotic dead. For a long time Mr. Bunn, shook his head, bold and head, and the resolute jaw did not relax. The House seemed as it on a funeral occasion. A sort of a shudder of awe went about it as if some violence had been done to the dead. Finally, Mr. Bunn, of North Carolina, decided evidently that it is not a fact that one man is wiser, more economical, braver, more patriotic than all other men, and the objection was withdrawn. But Mr. Bunn succeeded in securing a recognition in the Congressional Record and a place in the history of his country.

### Special Notices.

Bangor Council, No. 5, R. & S. M.

STATED ASSEMBLY, WEDNESDAY EVENING, MAR. 4, 1891.

Members are requested to be present.

For orders, see the *Advertiser*.

Confering of Royal Degrees.

11

Canton Bangor No. 3,

PATRIARCHS MILITANT.

Regular meeting Wednesday evening at 7 o'clock. Full attendance is desired.

A. L. HOPKINS, Commander.

Marine Journal.

DOMESTIC PORTS.

NEW YORK.—A special letter from G. H. Holden, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

BOSTON.—Mr. John K. Souther, Thompson, Royal, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

PHILADELPHIA.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEWPORT, R. I.—At the 14th and 15th of December, 1888, the U. S. Forest Survey Convention held at the Hotel Congress, and organized a committee to call the International Forest Congress.

FAIRDALE, MASS.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

PORTLAND, A. M.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

CHARLESTON, S. C.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.—At the 14th and 15th of December, 1888, the U. S. Forest Survey Convention held at the Hotel Congress, and organized a committee to call the International Forest Congress.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

PHILADELPHIA.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

NEW YORK.—Mr. John C. M. Knobell, Captain, St. Mary's 14 days old, says: "Admiral Porter, who has not yet been appointed to the rank of admiral, has been promoted to the rank of captain in the U. S. Navy."—*Advertiser*.

# CONGRESSIONAL.

Closing up the Business of the Session.

Both Branches Remain in Session all Night.

The Gavel Will Fall on the Final adjournment at Noon To-day.

Senate.

WASHINGTON, March 3. The Senate adjourned at noon and immediately went into executive session.

The doors were opened at 10:15, when general deficiency appropriation bill was read to and the amendments were read to and agreed to in Committee of the Whole last night we agreed to in the Senate, and the bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Edmunds made a point of order that the bill had not been referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Edmunds offered an amendment appropriating \$30,000 for the relief of citizens of Arkansas who had been rendered destitute by the unexpected drought of past season, agreed to.

The first of the several amendments as to payment to the Pacific railroads was agreed to without division. The next re-

view was that of the payment of the French contingent expenses.

Mr. Edmunds made a point of order that one of them was a purely private bill and had no business in an appropriation bill.

The point was overruled by the Vice

President.

The discussion was carried on at much length by Messrs. Evans, Stewart, Hoar, Jencks, Spooner, Morrill, Daniel, Blair, Hawley, the latter declaring that in things was he ashamed of his country, and that one of them.

Finally a vote was taken and the French contingent amendment was agreed to, 41, nays 14.

Mr. Frey offered an amendment ratifying the permanent territories granted by the Senate to the District of Columbia.

The extension of boundaries beyond the existing line but requiring such permits in future to have the assent of all the insensers.

Mr. Thurber made a point of order that the amendment did not oppose the motion.

After a discussion in which half a dozen took part the Vice President sustained the point of order.

Mr. Frey appealed from the decision of the Vice.

A vote was taken and the decision of the Vice was sustained, 41, nays 19.

The amendment was then agreed to.

Mr. Danl. moved to insert a paragraph in the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that the amount of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, South Carolina and the city of New York on account of advances made in 1861-1862 and 1863-1864 was \$2,500,000.

The motion was agreed to—yeas 25,

noes 12. Mr. Bur. offered an amendment to pay the surviving partner of W. H. Bur. \$10,000 overpaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

It was then agreed and sent back to the House with Senate amendments.

The Senate voted to insist on the amendment for a further conference.

The conference report on the Sunday Appropriation bill was taken up and

the House amendments to the Senate

to establish certain points of delivery in Alaska territory, reducing the amount from \$25,000 to \$10,000 were concurred in.

The conference report on the c-paragraph was read to and agreed to.

There was a point of order that the bill had been reached, the Sherman amendment allowing importation on payment of tariff duties of foreign copies of copyrighted books and the Ingalls amendment allowing the importation of newspapers and magazines, being satisfied that no Copyright bill could become a law with those two amendments.

Mr. Platt moved that the Senate re-consider the bill.

Mr. Sherman argued in support of his amendment that the Copyright bill, he said he would give to the publishers of the United States an absolute monopoly of the production of any book, but would give them the privilege of a protective duty, and would give employment to printers and capital, as in the case of other products of the country. If the bill became a law without the amendment he believed it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book. It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment) as it would be the most unpopular law in the statute book.

It was a spirit of monopoly, and an absolute prohibition at the foundation of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hinsck, one of the conferees, said the Senate did not recede from those statements it was a matter of no consequence whether the bill failed. He asked Mr. Sherman if he proposed by the amendment to give authors

the exclusive right to the sale of books in the United States.

Mr. Hinsck remarked there would be no difficulty in getting the bill passed.

He asserted no author would avail himself of the right act (with the Sherman amendment)

